



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/964,922	09/26/2001	Samuel Lee Miller	SD6549/S93815	3160

7590 11/18/2002
Kevin W. Bieg
Patent Attorney
Sandia National Laboratories
P. O. Box 5800 - MS-0161
Albuquerque, NM 87185-0161

EXAMINER

BUDD, MARK OSBORNE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2834

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

964 922

Applicant(s)

Miller et al

Examiner

M. Budd

Group Art Unit

2834

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 12-15 is/are rejected.
- ☒ Claim(s) 9-11 is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
 - ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
 - ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1 7.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 2(9-26-01)
- ☒ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2834

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

ClaimS 1, 3/1, 4/1, 12/1 and 13/1 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (a) as being anticipated by Ono, Corbett or Martin.

Claims 2, 3/2, 4/1, 8, 12/2 and 13/2 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Hatamura.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5/1, 6/1, 7/1, 14/1 and 15/1 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ono, Corbett or Martin.

One (e.g. fig 4) teaches a link mechanism having at least two anchor links #15, #16 and at least two platform links #18, #19, substrate #37 and a platform #33 (fig 5). Martin teaches substrate #26, platform #18, anchor links #4, #5 and platform links #600, #602 (note figs 1-3 and 5). The references do not teach the specific materials claimed or explicitly teach open loop control (no feedback). However, selection from among known materials has long been held to be within the skill expected of the routineer. Also, it is obvious that an unput circuit is required for

Art Unit: 2834

an operable device. Thus to select from specific, known materials and provide a suitable drive circuit would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Claims 5/2, 6/2, 7/2, 14/2 and 15/2 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatamura.

Hatamura teaches a substrate (#6 fig 2, #23 fig 10) a platform (#10 fig 2, #36 fig 10), anchor links (#7 fig 2, #50x fig 10) and platform links (#9 fig 2, #50Y or 50Z fig 10).

Hatamura does not teach

MARK J. BUDD
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 212